

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakamoto (U.S. Pat. No. 5,989,121). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a demonstration display method for a game machine comprising the steps of: displaying a changing display screen on a display unit, wherein the changing display screen corresponds to a presentation pattern from a plurality of presentation patterns; identifying a start pattern and a stationary pattern of the presentation pattern; and successively displaying the changing display screen on the display unit. The plurality of presentation patterns are arranged in a predetermined presentation sequence in a presentation specifying table. The start pattern and the stationary pattern of the presentation pattern are identified based on a record of the presentation specifying table corresponding to the presentation pattern. The changing display screen corresponds to each successive presentation pattern in the presentation specifying table based on the predetermined presentation sequence. Sakamoto fails to teach or suggest the demonstration display method recited by claim 1.

First, Sakamoto does not teach or suggest a demonstration display method. Rather, Sakamoto describes a game machine that operates in three game modes, e.g., regular game, B.B. game, and N.B. game. Sakamoto, col. 4, lines 24-25. Second, in

Sakamoto the game machine display is based on a position of rotating reels and on prize symbol combinations based on a random number sampling. Sakamoto, col. 1, lines 62-65; col. 3, lines 18-19. Sakamoto is silent as to a plurality of presentation patterns arranged in a predetermined presentation sequence in a presentation specifying table. Sakamoto is likewise silent as to displaying a changing display screen corresponding to each successive presentation pattern in the presentation specifying table, based on a predetermined presentation sequence.

An advantage of the demonstration display method recited by claim 1 is that during a demonstration, presentation patterns which are normally displayed at low probabilities can be reliably displaying in a comparatively short time based on the predetermined presentation sequence of the presentation specifying table. Specification, paragraph [0042]. As recited by claim 1, the changing display screen corresponds to successive presentation patterns in the presentation specifying table based on the predetermined presentation sequence. Sakamoto does not teach or suggest such a demonstration display method. Instead, the Sakamoto display during game play, not demonstration, is based on the position of the reels and the random number based prize symbol combination. Sakamoto, col. 1, lines 62-65; col. 3, lines 18-19.

Therefore, claim 1 defines over the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested. With regard to claims 2-4, Applicants note that claim 2-4 depend from claim 1, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, claims 2-4 also define over the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 5 recites a game machine for a demonstration comprising a display unit, a storage unit, and a control unit. The display unit displays a changing display screen that corresponds to a presentation pattern determined from a plurality of presentation patterns. The storage unit stores the plurality of presentation patterns arranged in a predetermined presentation sequence in a presentation specifying table. The control unit makes the display unit successively display the changing display screen, wherein the changing display screen corresponds to each successive presentation pattern in the presentation specifying table based on the predetermined presentation sequence.

Similar limitations are recited by claim 1. For at least the above reasons, claim 5 defines over the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested. With regard to claims 6-8, Applicants note that claims 6-8 depend from claim 5, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, claims 6-8 also define over the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 9 recites a demonstration display method for a game machine, including the step of sequentially displaying a plurality of changing display screens on a display unit, wherein the changing display screen corresponds to a presentation pattern which is determined from among a plurality of presentation patterns arranged in a predetermined presentation sequence in a presentation specifying table.

Similar limitations are recited by claim 1. For at least the above reasons, claim 9 defines over the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 16, 2006

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GGS/BEW/MPD/cn]